

REMARKS

This paper is filed in response to the final office action mailed on June 29, 2005. Claims 1-17 stand rejected; claims 1, 7, 10 and 13 have been amended; claim 14 has been cancelled; claims 1-17 remain pending.

The total number claims have been reduced and all claims have been placed in a condition for allowance and therefore entry of this amendment under Rule 116 is respectfully solicited.

The final office action rejects claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over WO 02/15735 ("Unilever") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,767,126 ("Miller").

In response, each independent claim has been amended to make it clear that the first base suspension added to the container is free of colorant and is used to coat the bottom and at least part of the sidewall of the container to prevent colorants from engaging these parts of the container. See the specification at page 5, lines 5-12. This step is not taught or suggested by either Unilever or Miller. Neither Miller nor Unilever even recognize the problem of colorants coating the inside surfaces of a clear container resulting in streaks that are not removed even after a vigorous mixing. See the present specification at page 1, lines 21-32.

Further, the independent claims have been amended to make it clear that the final base suspension added to the container is also free of colorant and it *is the last ingredient added* thereby sandwiching the suspensions containing colorant between the first or lower and last or upper base suspensions. This feature is not taught or suggested by Unilever or Miller.

Finally, the elements of claims 2, 7, 10 and 13 relating to the stopper and the preventing of colorants from migrating up the neck of the bottle during mixing have not been addressed in the earlier office actions. See the specification at page 7, line 29 to page 8, line 18. Neither Unilever nor Miller address this problem

Applicant respectfully submits that amended claims 1, 7, 10 and 13 are all allowable over any hypothetical combination of Unilever and Miller for the following reasons. At the outset, under MPEP § 2142,

[t]o establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the

knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure."

Citing, In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991); see also MPEP § 2143-§ 2143.03 for decisions pertinent to each of these criteria.

No combination of Unilever and Miller teaches or suggests all of the limitations of the pending independent claims. Specifically, Unilever in no way teaches or suggests adding a first base suspension that is free of colorant to a container *to coat the bottom and lower sidewall of the container prior to the addition of suspensions that contain colorant*. See the specification at page 5, lines 5-12.

Neither Unilever nor Miller teach or suggest adding a base suspension *last after all of the other ingredients have been added* whereby the last base suspension is also free of colorant.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the position taken by the Patent Office on pages 2-3 of the office action. The order of the claimed steps must be considered and the novel order as claimed is simply not taught by Unilever. Miller is only cited for the proposition that it teaches mixing. Neither of these references address the problems of mixability of cosmetics preparations.

Page 4 of Unilever in no way teaches or suggests adding "suspensions comprising one or more colorants on top of a first base suspension" as alleged by the Patent Office. Instead, page 4 of Unilever merely provides two groups or classes of performing agents that can be modified when customizing a personal care formulation. Unilever suggests no order of addition of its ingredients. Unilever in no way makes it clear that any one of these classes includes base suspensions and Unilever in no way suggests that base should be added to the container *first and last* as recited in each pending independent claim to avoid colorant streaks on the inside surface of a clear container.

Instead, Unilever only suggests at page 5, lines 10-13 that "certain products will have greater stability if dosed in a specific sequence such as for body toner where the product base should be dosed first, for maximum stability." This statement and teaching has

nothing to do with mixability. Each pending independent claim of the present application requires a specific order where a base to be added first to coat the bottom and lower portion of the sidewall to thereby keep colorant off of this portion of the container. See the specification at page 7, lines 10-28.

The claims require the coating of the bottom and lower sidewall with base to be followed by one or more suspensions containing colorants, followed by a final base dose that is last ingredient added. The base suspensions must be free of colorant.

Because Unilever does not even address the problems of mixability or the coating of the sides or bottom of a clear container with colorant, and further because Unilever in no way teaches or suggests adding a base first, followed by colorants, followed by a final base, Unilever is clearly deficient as a base reference for pending independent claims 1, 10, 7 and 13.

Further, Unilever does not teach or suggest the use of a stopper to keep colorants off of the inside of a bottle neck.

The Miller reference merely teaches a gyroscopic mixer and therefore cannot supplement Unilever with respect to any of the deficiencies addressed above.

Accordingly, no combination of Miller and Unilever teaches or suggests every limitation of independent claims 1, 7, 10 and 13 and therefore claims 1-17 are clearly allowable over any hypothetical combination of these references.

If the examiner disagrees, applicant invites the examiner to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below to discuss this application further.

An early action indicating the allowability of this application is respectfully requested. A new power of attorney and revocation of prior powers is forthcoming. The undersigned verifies that he is authorized to act on behalf of applicant.

Dated: September 28, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Michael R. Hull

Registration No.: 35,902
MILLER, MATTHIAS & HULL
One North Franklin Street, Suite 2350
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 977-9902 ext. 203
Attorney for Applicant